



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/663,701	09/17/2003	Sung Uk Moon	242937US90	3971
22850	7590	12/28/2006	EXAMINER	
OBLON, SPIVAK, MCCLELLAND, MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C. 1940 DUKE STREET ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314			WENDELL, ANDREW	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2618	
SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE		MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
3 MONTHS		12/28/2006	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/663,701	MOON ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Andrew Wendell	2618	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 05 October 2006.

2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1,2,4 and 5 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1,2,4 and 5 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some * c) None of:

1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application
Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Double Patenting

1. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

2. Claims 4 and 5 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 3-5 of U.S. Patent Application No. 2004/0058696. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the claims in the application are broader than the ones in the U.S. Patent Application No. 2004/0058696. Therefore, the claims read on the application.

Regarding claim 4, U.S. Patent Application No. 2004/0058696 teaches a radio network controller supporting multicast communication, wherein the radio network controller performs a predetermined processing on a predetermined number of response signals, the predetermined number of response signals being transmitted from

at least one first mobile station and responding to a control signal for a multicast group; and the radio network controller performs processing on only the predetermined number of response signals, and any following response signal is unprocessed by the radio network controller, the following response signals being transmitted from at least one second mobile station (See claims 3 and 4).

Regarding claim 5, claim 5 reads on claim 5 of U.S. Patent Application No. 2004/0058696.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.

Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1-2 and 4-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gosselin (WO 01/65885) in view of Beckmann et al. (US Pat Pub# 2003/0022683) and further in view of Jellema et al. (US Pat# 6,707,900).

Regarding claim 1, Gosselin's multicasting communication network teaches a base station 30 (Figs. 1-3) supporting multicast communication, the base station comprising a response signal relay configured to transfer response signals transmitted from a plurality of mobile stations 40 (Figs. 1-3) to a radio network controller (not shown, but in a cellular system (page 7 lines 8-32) it is known to be part of the make of a

communication system), the response signals responding to a control signal for a multicast group (Page 4 line 30-Page 5 line 15). Gosselin fails to teach a predetermined number of response signals and clearly showing a radio network controller.

In the same field of endeavor, Beckmann et al. transmitting multicast messages in a radio system teaches a base station BS (Fig. 1) supporting multicast communication, the base station comprising a plurality of mobile stations UE1-5 (Fig. 1), a radio network controller RNC (Fig. 1), and a control signal for a multicast group (Sections 0007-0013 and 0049-0054)

Therefore, it would have been obvious at the time of the invention to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate a radio network controller as taught by Beckmann et al. into Gosselin's multicasting communication network in order to transmit messages with little expenditure and reduce load (Section 0004).

Both Beckmann and Gosselin fail to teach a predetermined number of response signals.

Jellema et al. dynamic load limiting teaches wherein the response signal relay transfers only a predetermined number of response signals to the radio network controller, and any following response signal is retained (Fig. 2 and Col. 2 lines 60-67).

Therefore, it would have been obvious at the time of the invention to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate a predetermined number of response signals as taught by Jellema et al. into a radio

network controller as taught by Beckmann et al. into Gosselin's multicasting communication network in order to avoid overloaded conditions and have a more efficient system (Col. 1 lines 22-30).

Regarding claim 2, Jellema further teaches wherein the predetermined number is one (Fig. 2, step 26, the value could be set to one or any number).

Regarding claim 4, apparatus claim 4 is rejected for the same reason as apparatus claim 1 since the recited elements would perform the claimed steps.

Regarding claim 5, apparatus claim 5 is rejected for the same reason as apparatus claim 2 since the recited elements would perform the claimed steps.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Andrew Wendell whose telephone number is 571-272-0557. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:30-5 M-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nay Maung can be reached on 571-272-7882. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Lana N. Le
LANA LE
PRIMARY EXAMINER

Andrew Wendell
Andrew Wendell
Examiner
Art Unit 2618

12/13/2006